

May 8, 1973

(Start of Belt #11)

store that might sell beer, is that an organization? I mean...I..the..well, to keep...not from keeping on going but the word organizations doesn't to me seem to adequately identify or...the proper...doesn't seem to be the proper word to me of what we are attempting to do.

PRESIDENT: Senator Luedtke, do you care to respond?

SENATOR LUEDTKE: Mr. President, I will respond to that. I agree with you, Senator Syas. I don't believe the word organization in this particular part of the amendment is proper. I would say that because we are referring to stock, in the first place, it should be corporation because there is no other organization, business organization, that has stock but a corporation so that should read any corporation holding a liquor license and then later on you, perhaps, should say that any officer shall not participate and probably should also say they should not hold office nor participate in any manner in the management or administration of the corporation. Now, as far as Mom and Pop stores, they obviously are not covered under this anyway because you don't have stock in them unless they are incorporated. If they are incorporated, then they would be under it.

PRESIDENT: All right. Next to speak then is Senator Chambers and then Senator Marsh.

SENATOR CHAMBERS: Mr. President, I don't object to what Senator Whitney is talking about doing and he clearly understands the intent of the law. Senator Goodrich understands the intent of the law, too, and I understand and think I do Senator Goodrich's intent and it is contrary to that of the law, so if he is willing to go along with what Senator Whitney is suggesting about limiting the percentage of ownership, I am willing to go along with it too. Senator Goodrich will stand up and talk about police officers owning stock in United Airlines and yet he doesn't give one example of a policeman who came to him and said, I've got to sell my stock in United. He can't tell one police officer who has told him he has to sell his stock in the railroad or any other large scale corporation, most of them dealing in interstate commerce and making multi-million dollars a year. So he is dealing with intangibles and hypotheticals. I am dealing with situations which are concrete, which are fraught with dangers to the welfare of the public and they are happening. Watergate shows that merely because an individual holds a title of respect does not mean that he is a respectable individual. It does not mean that a man who is sworn to uphold the law is going to abide by the law. So we build into the statutes protections and safeguards for the public against abuses of the law even by those who were sworn to uphold the law. There is a Latin phrase which says, there are the watchers but who will watch the watchers. In this case, the Legislature must do some of it and I think the majority of the members of this body know what this bill is designed to deal with and any reasonable amendment which does not frustrate that primary intent, I am not opposed to. Senator Whitney's information that he is giving now coincides with what he said on the floor Friday and I said at that time I did not object to that type of restrictive amendment but to take one which is so open ended like that offered by Senator Goodrich may, in its operation, defeat ultimately some of the primary aspects of the bill. So I am telling you now on Senator Whitney's amendment, if he is framing it or that language is incorporated into an amendment, I would not object to it.

PRESIDENT: Now, Senator Whitney, do you have another amendment or is there...Senator Whitney.

SENATOR WHITNEY: Mr. President, members of the Legislature,